



---

# Select Committee on Health

## Special Report Future Directions for Child Care in Ontario

3rd Session 33rd Parliament  
36 Elizabeth II







Government  
Publications

CA20N  
XC 2  
- 85/H22

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE

The Honourable Hugh Edighoffer, M.P.P.  
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

Sir,

Your Select Committee on Health has the honour to present  
its Special Report on Child Care and commends it to the  
House.

Robert V. Callahan  
Chairman



MEMBERSHIP OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE  
ON HEALTH

ROBERT V. CALLAHAN

Chairman


PHILIP ANDREWES  
REUBEN BAETZ  
DAVE COOKE (WINDSOR-RIVERSIDE)  
JOSEPH CORDIANO  
CHRISTINE HART

JAMES D. HENDERSON  
RICHARD F. JOHNSTON  
DOUGLAS R. REYCRAFT  
BETTE M. STEPHENSON, M.D.  
JOHN M. TURNER

---

DEBORAH DELLER  
Clerk of the Committee

CATHY FOOKS  
Research Officer



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114667413>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
INTRODUCTION	3
STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES	6
Societal Trends	6
Evolution of Care	7
Delivery Models	8
CURRENT STATUS	10
Day Nurseries Operator Types	11
Number of Facilities and Spaces	12
Size of Facilities	12
Enrolment	13
Subsidized Children	13
Age Distribution of Children	13
Funding	14
Expenditures	15
Accountability	15
i) Financial	15
Recommendations	16
ii) Regulatory Standards	16
a) Centre Space and Facilities:	17
b) Day Nursery Staff	18
Inspections	18
Recommendations	18
Working Conditions	19
Private Home Child Care	20
ISSUES	
Availability of Spaces	23
Informal Sector	24
Recommendations	24
1) Expansion of Child Care Spaces	24
2) Municipal Role	25
Affordability	25
Recommendations	26
Quality of Care	27
General Ratings on Quality of Care	34
Recommendations	35
COMMITTEE HEARINGS	
Arguments Against Funding of Commercial Operators	38
Arguments In Favour of Funding of Commercial Operators	39
Recommendations Presented During Committee Hearings	39
SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS	46



## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page No.</u>
TABLES	
Table 1: Number of Licensed Day Nurseries and Market Share in Ontario by Auspice, 1980 - 1986	51
Table 2: Number of Licensed Spaces and Market Share in Ontario by Auspice, 1980 - 1986	52
Table 3: Average Capacity of Facilities in Ontario by Auspice, 1980 - 1986	53
Table 4: Full-Time Enrolment and Part-Time Enrolment by Auspice, 1980 and 1986	54
Table 5: Subsidized Children in Full-Time and Part-Time Enrolment in Ontario by Auspice, 1986	55
Table 6: Age Distribution of Children in Ontario by Auspice, 1986	56
Table 7: Licensed Day Nurseries - Expenditures in Ontario, 1976/77 - 1986/87	57
Table 8: Number of Staff Required for a Day Nursery in Ontario, 1986	58
Table 9: Private Home Child Care Agencies and Spaces in Ontario, 1985	59
Table 10: Income Turning Points Under CAP to Determine Likelihood of Need, Ontario, 1983 and 1986	60
Table 11: Percent Distribution of Non-Profit and Commercial Centres By Staff/Child Ratio, 1972	61
Table 12: Percent Distribution of Non-Profit and Commercial Centres By Average Group Size, 1972	62
Table 13: Percent Distribution by Levels of Education, 1986	63
Table 14: Average Hourly Wages By Auspice, 1986	64
Table 15: Percent Distribution of Benefits Coverage by Auspice, 1986	65
FOOTNOTES	66
BIBLIOGRAPHY	69
DISSENTING OPINION: NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY	72
APPENDIX A: List of Witnesses	
APPENDIX B: Child Care Standards By Province, 1986	



### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During its examination of child care in Ontario the Select Committee on Health was ably assisted by a number of individuals.

Committee Clerk Deborah Deller and Clerk Pro Tem Tannis Manikel arranged for groups and individuals to appear before the Committee to present their views.

Cathy Fooks, of the Legislative Research Service, provided background material to the Committee and, pursuant to the Committee's instructions, drafted the report.

Finally, the Committee wishes to express its appreciation to all those groups and individuals who appeared before it. Their views on the future of child care in Ontario were most helpful to the Committee in its deliberations and of great interest to Committee members.



## **INTRODUCTION**





In July of 1986, the Legislature of Ontario authorized the Select Committee on Health to examine issues related to the role of the commercial, for-profit sector in health and social services. The Committee's mandate was to recommend what role the commercial, for-profit sector should play in the provision of services in Ontario.

The Committee decided an essential first step in its inquiry would be to determine the extent of for-profit activity in health and social services in Ontario. It was felt that this could best be done by compiling an inventory of service delivery by program area. This inventory forms the basis of the Select Committee's Interim Report.

On the basis of its review of the limited statistical information available and a recognition of the concern and interest of the public, the Committee decided to examine the area of child care in further detail.

Data in the Committee's Interim Report indicate that commercial activity within the child care sector is significant and has played an important role for some time. The Committee felt the mix of municipal, non-profit and commercial operators in Ontario warranted further examination. Furthermore, as negotiations are underway at present between the provincial and federal governments as to the future of child care arrangements across the country, the Committee felt it to be an appropriate time to voice its thoughts on this issue.

Public hearings were held from March 23, 1987 to April 10, 1987 on commercial and non-profit child care. (A list of witnesses before the Committee can be found in Appendix A.)

It was apparent from these hearings that an examination of child care encompasses more than licensed, centre-based care. Issues such as the importance of child-rearing at home with tax credits for parents and expanded parental leaves, are part of an examination of child care. However, due to the nature of the Committee's mandate, the focus of this report is on the commercial/non-profit debate for licensed centre-based care.

The report has six sections:

Introduction: this section explains the Committee's mandate and the process through which the Committee organized its hearings and report writing.

Statement of Principles: this section outlines a number of basic principles from which the Committee's examination of child care has evolved.

Current Status: this section describes the current child care system in Ontario.

Issues: this section outlines the issues raised in the available literature on child care and during the Committee's public hearings.

Committee Hearings: this section presents the arguments and recommendations given to the Committee during its public hearings.

Recommendations: this section contains the Select Committee's recommendations.



## **STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES**



There are a number of basic principles from which the Committee's examination of child care has evolved.

### Societal Trends

The increased participation of women in the labour force has been a significant factor in the demand for child care. According to Statistics Canada:<sup>1</sup>

- the participation rate for women with children under three years of age has risen from 31.2% in 1976 to 45% in 1986;
- the participation rate for women with children between 3 and 5 years of age has risen from 41% in 1976 to 52% in 1986;
- the proportion of families where both parents work outside the home has increased from 20% in 1961 to 48% in 1981;
- in 1986, 57% of mothers in two-parent families were employed;
- in 1981, 82.6% of lone-parent families were headed by women.

Concurrent with an increase in the number of women working has been a decrease in the average size of Canadian families. In 1961, married women between the ages of 25 and 34 had an average of 2.5 children. 12% of the same age group did not have children. In 1981, the same age group averaged 1.7 children with 22% not having children.<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, there has been an increase in the number of single-parent families headed by a parent under 35 from 14% in 1951 to 28% in 1981.<sup>3</sup> Within this group, families headed by women are the poorest, with 60% headed by women having a pre-tax income of \$20,000 or less in 1985.<sup>4</sup>

These statistics indicate that more women with young children (both married and single-parents) are in the labour force and therefore need some form of child care for their children. (For a discussion of the actual numbers of children, see Availability under Issues.)



Thus, for many families in 1987 some form of child care is a necessity not only for economic reasons but also socially, in order to allow women equal participation in Canadian society.

### **Evolution of Care**

As our society has changed over the last twenty-five years, so has our need for and attitudes toward child care. Twenty-five years ago, child care was equated with baby-sitting. As the majority of women worked solely inside the home, child care was a temporary "relief" service for parents.

Increasingly however, child care outside the family became viewed as an educational opportunity for gifted children and/or children of wealthy parents.

Today, however, good quality child care is seen to be beneficial for children and parents alike. Some of the benefits identified are as follows:

- to provide children with opportunities for physical, intellectual and emotional development through interaction with other children and adults;
- to allow children with special needs to receive specially designed programs;
- to provide good quality care when a parent or parents are working, attending school full-time, or attending a training or re-training program;
- to provide good quality care when a parent or parents are attending a work-related function (conferences, workshops, out-of-town business trips);
- to provide good quality care for children in families with special needs (chronic health problems, background or high risk of neglect and/or child abuse, marital or other family problems);
- to provide good quality care in emergency situations (family illness);

- to provide good quality care in temporary situations (childbirth, seasonal employment, school programs ending for the summer, professional development days, holidays etc.).

In these ways child care is seen to be a basic support service for families and individual children.

### **Delivery Models**

Given that attitudes towards child care have changed, current models of service delivery must also change.

At present, child care is still based on the "welfare model"; that is, service is limited and subsidies are given to those "in need" based on a needs test. Within such a model, problems of availability (spaces), affordability (fees) and quality of care have been documented. Specific questions as to service delivery will be addressed later in this report. It has been argued, however, that an optimum delivery system cannot be developed within the "welfare model."

Thus a change in philosophy is needed for future delivery of child care services. There is a strong philosophic parallel with Ontario's system of public education. Education is provided to all children regardless of their family's financial situation. Parents have the right to choose the method of education they wish for their children. This philosophy is one which could be adapted for child care. Elements such as availability, affordability, choice, quality and parental involvement are all appropriate principles for a child care system. The system should be structured in such a way that the "average" working family in Ontario would be able to avail itself of good quality, affordable child care if it chose to do so.





### CURRENT STATUS



Child care in Ontario is legislated under the Day Nurseries Act through the Family Services and Income Maintenance Division of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Licenses are issued to day nurseries and private home day care agencies based on provincial standards.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services uses the Day Nurseries Information System (DNIS) as its primary collection source of information. However, the Ministry recognizes there are the following "input deficiencies" with the system.

When entering information, the DNIS does not include a non-profit category. A non-profit organization may be incorporated under the Cooperative Corporations Act or the Corporations Act. An organization incorporated under either legislation can choose to obtain charitable status (which means it must be non-profit). Thus, the non-charitable corporations category could include commercial endeavours and non-profits which have not obtained charitable status.

The DNIS category "Individuals for an Unincorporated Group" is defined as persons who act on behalf of a group not yet incorporated. It could therefore contain both non-profit unincorporated groups such as parent co-ops and profit groups not yet incorporated. The Ministry of Community and Social Services groups this category with other profit categories. As the breakdown within the category is not clear, however, it has been treated as a separate category for the purposes of this report.

Thirdly, the number of subsidized children reported by the DNIS is an underestimate. When a day nursery is opened, the number of subsidized children is not known and therefore not recorded. For centres with a large proportion of subsidized children it is assumed that the DNIS does not require this information and it is not recorded.

Finally, the DNIS can only provide data from 1980 onwards; thus, the statistical information is confined to 1980 - 1986. Furthermore, because data is reported on the anniversary date of individual nurseries, the information changes for each reporting period. Therefore it is important to note the program run date indicated for each table when reviewing material.

### Day Nurseries Operator Types

The following operator types are used by the DNIS:

#### Not-For-Profit:

Approved Charitable:	corporation approved to receive a subsidy of 80% of approved operating costs for non-handicapped children. There is also an 80/20 cost sharing arrangement for minor and major capital expenses.
Approved Charitable Corporation:	corporation approved to receive a subsidy of 87% of approved operating costs for handicapped children under 5 and 100% of approved operating costs for handicapped children over 5. There is also an 80/20 cost sharing for minor and major capital expenses.
Charitable Corporation:	corporation without share capital which has objectives of a charitable nature and is incorporated under a general or specific Act. No one may personally profit from the corporation.
Indian Band:	an Indian Band may form a band council to provide the same services as a municipality.

#### Public Sector

Municipal Corporation:	municipality whose by-laws allow them to provide day nursery services, enter into agreements to provide private-home day care and provide purchase-of-service arrangements for those parents in need.
------------------------	---

#### For-Profit:

Non-Charitable Corporation:	corporation which operates day nurseries on a for-profit basis.
Private Individual:	a sole operator of day nursery services.

#### Other

Individual for an Unincorporated Group:	a person who acts on behalf of an unincorporated group offering day nursery services.
---	---

The term non-profit is applied to those corporations formed to carry out a charitable, educational, religious or social activity for the benefit of its members and/or the public at large. They may receive income from public donations and with approval from the federal Department of Revenue the donations can be tax deductible.

Such corporations obtain letters patent incorporating them as a body corporate without share capital under the Canada Corporations Act. The application for incorporation must provide for the limitation that the

corporation shall be carried on without the purpose of gain to its members and that any profits or other accretions to the corporation shall be used in promoting its objects...The corporation cannot pay dividends and no member may receive any profit or gain.<sup>6</sup>

### Number of Facilities and Spaces

Child care in Ontario is provided by a mix of operators as outlined above. Table 1 indicates the number of licensed facilities in Ontario for the period December 1980 – December 1986 by auspice. Table 2 indicates the number of spaces by auspice for the same period.

In December of 1986 there were 2,226 centres licensed to provide care with 82,280 spaces. Of this, 45.0% of spaces (37,023) were in the commercial sector and 40.9% (33,686) were in the private-not-for-profit sector.<sup>7</sup>

### Size of Facilities

The size of facilities varies by operator type. Public sector centres are the largest in the market with an average of 48.5 spaces per facility in 1986. The private-for-profit sector facilities are the next largest with 40.6 spaces per facility. The private not-for-profit sector facilities are smaller on average with 33 spaces. Overall, the average capacity of the system has remained stable at approximately 37 spaces per facility. (See Table 3)



### Enrolment

In general, the trend over the last six years has been away from full-time enrolment to part-time enrolment in facilities. Today, 59.8% of total enrolment is part-time and 40.2% is full-time, compared with 1980 figures of 57.8% part-time enrolment and 42.2% full-time enrolment. (See Table 4)

### Subsidized Children

The distribution of children where spaces are subsidized is as follows:

- private-not-for-profit: constitutes 39.6% of total subsidized enrolment with 28.3% full-time and 11.4% part-time;
- private-for-profit: constitutes 31.6% of total subsidized enrolment with 28.3% full-time and 3.3% part-time;
- public sector: constitutes 27.7% of total subsidized enrolment with 6.9% full-time and 20.8% part-time;
- individual for an unincorporated group: constitutes 1.0% of total subsidized enrolment with 0.5% full-time and 0.4% part-time. (See Table 5)

### Age Distribution of Children

Of a total enrolment of 101,062, 63.8% (64,445) are preschool children, toddlers and infants. 39.9% (25,697) of these children are enrolled in the private-not-for-profit sector and 48.5% (31,270) are in the private-for-profit sector. (See Table 6)

36.2% (36,617) of enrolled children are 4 years old and older. 45.4% (16,608) of these children are enrolled in the private-not-for-profit sector. (See Table 6)

### Funding

The major federal-provincial funding vehicle for child care programs is the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP). It provides for federal cost-sharing of 50¢ of every dollar. Child care is funded under the social assistance and the social services provisions of CAP.

Under the social assistance provision, eligibility for service is based on a needs test established by the province. A ceiling is not placed on the total cost-shared amount and there are no restrictions as to whether service is provided in the commercial or the non-profit sector. According to economist Monica Townson, if the service is provided by a private sector agency (non-profit or commercial) the cost sharing is based on the actual fee charged. If the service is provided by a government agency (in the case of child care, a municipality), the fees charged may not exceed the actual cost of providing the service.<sup>8</sup>

Under the social services provision of CAP, the focus for cost-sharing is on the agency providing service rather than the individual. To be eligible for cost-sharing, an agency must be a "provincially approved" agency. Commercial agencies cannot, at present, attain approved status.

The following items are eligible for cost-sharing:

- salaries and wages for full-time and part-time employees;
- employee benefits;
- out-of-pocket expenses for volunteers;
- operating costs of providing services including rental of equipment, car rental, purchase of or the depreciation on any equipment when the cost is not in excess of \$1,000 or when the cost exceeds \$1,000 and has prior provincial approval, materials used, rental of land or space or the cost of depreciation of space;
- travel costs, conference registration fees, in-service training programs;
- cost of research and consultation, demonstration projects.

According to Townson, "agency costs are shared only to the extent that the services are provided to persons in need."<sup>9</sup> Therefore, if total operating costs for a centre are \$100,000 with the provincial/municipal share being \$75,000 and parent fees being \$25,000; only the \$75,000 would be eligible for cost-sharing. Capital costs and costs attributable to those clients not classified as "in need" must be deducted and the federal government will then cost-share the remainder.

At present, there are no direct government grants to centres for operating expenses. (Operating costs can be cost-shared for non-profit centres.) There is provision for start-up, expansion and staff training grants for non-profit centres.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services does not provide direct grants to commercial operators. Operators can receive public money through purchase of service agreements.

Recently, the Minister of Community and Social Services stated that as commercial operators constitute a significant part of the system, he would support direct grants to them. Furthermore, the Minister stated that grants to the commercial sector would be a topic of discussion between the provinces and the federal government.

### Expenditures

The Ministry of Community and Social Services spending on child care is detailed in Table 7. In constant dollars, expenditures have increased from \$46 million for 1976/77 to \$108 million for 1986/87.

### Accountability

#### i) Financial

All corporations must have an annual audit whether or not they receive government subsidies. Agencies receiving funds under the social services provision of CAP (approved corporations, municipalities, Indian Bands) must file financial statements, proof of audits and annual budgets.

Agencies with a purchase of service agreement under the social assistance provision of CAP (commercial and non-profit) must make their financial accounts available upon request and must submit monthly claim forms along with monthly attendance records for subsidized children.

Although there is provision for the government to review the financial books of child care operators receiving government funds, this does not appear to be a regular procedure used by Ministry officials. Therefore the Ministry does not have a database of financial information for the industry and cannot provide figures on operating costs, capital costs or profit levels.

This situation is of particular concern with regard to commercial operators as it is unclear how much profit is being made by private companies receiving public dollars.

### **Recommendations**

The Committee recommends that:

- all licensed centres that receive public funding shall be required to report all financial information to the Ministry and shall be required to post financial information publicly on the premises in the same way as provided in the Nursing Home Amendment Act.

### **ii) Regulatory Standards:**

Each licensed centre undergoes an annual license review by Ministry of Community and Social Services child care consultants. Each consultant maintains paper files on the centres for which they are responsible. On-site inspections ensure that municipal fire, health and zoning requirements are met along with provincial standards of care as described in the Regulations of the Day Nurseries Act. It is important to note that standards as laid out in the Act are the minimum required. (See Appendix B for a comparison of standards across the country.)

Some examples of the Regulations in Ontario are as follows.<sup>10</sup>

**a) Centre Space and Facilities:**

- every day nursery must have 2.8 square metres of unobstructed indoor play space for each child;
- for children under 18 months of age: a separate play activity room for each 10 children or less and a sleeping area that is separated from any play activity space for each group of 10 children or less (requirements change according to the age of the children);
- every day nursery must have designated space for eating, washing, dressing, toileting, isolation of sick children, storage for food, toys, indoor play materials, medical supplies, cleaning equipment, food preparation, staff rest area, office area.
- washrooms must include:
  - for every 10 children under 18 months: one sink and one flush toilet and adjacent counter suitable for dressing and changing diapers;
  - for every 15 children 18 – 30 months: one sink and one flush toilet and adjacent counter suitable for dressing and changing diapers;
  - for every 15 children 31 months to five years: one sink and one flush toilet;
- cribs are needed for each child under 18 months and a cot is necessary for each child 18 months – 5 years;
- each child under one year of age must be fed in accordance with written instructions from a parent;
- each child one year of age or over is to be fed a balanced midday meal with nutritious snacks served between meals;



### **b) Day Nursery Staff:**

Each day nursery must have a supervisor with a diploma in early childhood education (or the equivalent academic qualification) and 2 years of experience working in a day nursery. Each day nursery must employ a certain number of trained staff for each group of children as outlined in Table 8.

### **Inspections**

While each consultant has information for specific centres in their files, this information is not collected centrally. Therefore, the Ministry of Community and Social Services does not have a central database for the number of inspections undertaken (as a result of re-licensing, follow-ups or complaints), the number of violations of the Act or how often enforcement/consultation procedures are used by consultants for those centres not maintaining proper conditions. Therefore it is not known how many centres regularly meet standards, how many do not or how many make use of the consultants' advice and guidance.

The Select Committee views this situation with great concern. The "clients" involved in this program are not in a position to complain and as inspection reports are not publicly posted, parents are often unaware of a centre's deficiencies. The fact that the Ministry of Community and Social Services appears not to know how successful the inspection process is in terms of operator compliance with the Day Nurseries Act raises serious questions as to the quality of care being delivered.

### **Recommendations**

The Committee recommends that the Ministry of Community and Social Services undertake the following:

- the creation of a central database containing the number of inspections (re-licensing inspections, unannounced visits and those inspections resulting from a complaint), violations of the Day Nurseries Act, follow-up procedures and any fines or charges laid for each child care centre in Ontario;
- the separation of the inspection/enforcement role of a Ministry inspector from the consultative/advisory role of a Ministry inspector;
- the hiring of more inspectors in recognition of the separation of responsibilities;
- the undertaking of more inspections without notice;
- the posting of inspection reports in each child care centre;
- the posting of basic regulations in each child care centre to be seen by parents and other interested parties, i.e. staff:child ratios, staff qualifications, space allocations and other regulations the Ministry feels are the most significant;
- the provision of a written service contract between child care operators and parents detailing the basic regulations for standards of care and expectations of the operator and the parent(s).

#### Working Conditions

The DNIS estimates that staffing as of July 31, 1986 in child care centres is as follows (separate totals by operator type were not provided):

	<u>Total Staff</u> <sup>3</sup>	<u>Trained Staff</u> <sup>4</sup>	<u>% Trained</u>
Non-profit <sup>1</sup>	4,590(39.9%)	3,490(40.7%)	76.0
Commercial <sup>2</sup>	5,641(49.0%)	3,885(45.4%)	68.9
Municipal and Indian Band	1,286(11.2%)	1,190(13.9%)	92.5
	11,517	8,565	74.4

- <sup>1</sup>Non-profit: charitable corporation, approved charitable corporation and approved charitable handicapped corporation;
- <sup>2</sup>Commercial: private individual, individual for an unincorporated group, non-charitable corporation;
- <sup>3</sup>Total Staff: all teaching staff including trained, in-training, para-professional and untrained staff;
- <sup>4</sup>Trained Staff: includes trained and in-training staff.

It has been documented by two recent studies that working conditions (salaries and benefits) for these staff, both trained and untrained, are not commensurate with the importance of the work they do. Child care workers work long hours often for low salaries and marginal benefits. (See Section on Quality of Care.)

### Private Home Child Care

An alternative to licensed child care is that of private home child care. Private home child care is defined as "temporary care of five or fewer children under 10 years of age in a private residence other than the home of a parent or guardian."<sup>11</sup> Care is provided for a fee under the supervision of a private home child care agency and must not exceed a period of 24 hours.

The individual providing care has an agreement with and is supervised by a licensed home child care agency. In Ontario, it is the agency that is licensed and not the actual home. The agency can be a non-profit or a commercial agency and has the following responsibilities:

- to screen and select care providers;
- to offer orientation, consultation, training, supervision;
- to match parents and children with providers;

- to maintain a liaison with appropriate Ministry of Community and Social Services personnel.

The agency may collect the fees from the parents, pay the provider, and provide toys and equipment to the provider.

The agency must employ one full-time visitor for every 25 private home locations. The visitor must have a post-secondary program of studies in child development and family studies and two years experience working with children.

In return for the provision of service the agency receives a per diem administrative fee which is approximately 25% of total fees paid for care. The remaining 75% goes to the providers.

Table 9 indicates the number of private home child care agencies providing service in Ontario in 1985.

## ISSUES





### Availability of Spaces

There are a number of problems with the availability of licensed child care spaces. The foremost is that demand far exceeds supply. The 1984 Task Force on Child Care estimated there were 1,950,000 children between the ages of birth – 12 years across Canada with parents working or studying a minimum of 20 hours a week.<sup>12</sup> These children would presumably need care for part or all of a week day. If compared to the estimated 1984 figure of 171,654 licensed spaces, 8.8% of these children were in licensed care.<sup>13</sup>

The recent federal House of Commons Special Committee on Child Care analyzed the availability of space for pre-school children and cites the following Health and Welfare Canada figures for the percentage of children served:

Number of Licensed Spaces as a Percentage of Number  
of Children Likely to Need Non-Parental Care, 1986<sup>14</sup>

aged	0 – 17 months:	6.9%
aged	18 – 35 months:	13.9%
aged	3 – 5 years:	33.9%

The Special Committee concluded, "the evidence before the Committee leads us to conclude that there are currently problems in matching the supply of various types of child care services to the demand."<sup>15</sup>

The second key problem is the uneven distribution of spaces across the province. This is of particular importance in the rural areas of Ontario. Thirdly, the varying needs of parents' work schedules are often not met by the centres currently operating. For example, workers on shifts, or those who work weekends or overtime, often have difficulty finding a centre that can accommodate those hours. Fourthly, the varying needs of Ontario's ethnic communities are not reflected in many child care programs.

These availability problems are of concern economically in that they may affect decisions with regard to work, i.e. one parent may not be working due to a lack of child care although the second income would be welcome. It is also of concern socially in that some children who might benefit from the educational and social aspects of childcare are not receiving service.

**i) Informal Sector:**

Having a relative or friend or neighbour care for their child is a method used by many parents. What is not clear, however, is whether the decision is a real choice or is made by necessity due to a lack of alternatives.

Increasing the number of child care spaces will allow parents to have real choice in parenting, working and in the care and education of their children. For those parents who are pleased with their current child care arrangements nothing will change. For those parents who are not satisfied with their arrangements, however, expansion will provide varied alternatives.

**Recommendations**

**1) Expansion of Child Care Spaces**

The Committee recommends the following:

- the government should undertake an expansion of the number of spaces in the existing child care system in Ontario and that this should occur in the non-profit (private-not-for-profit and municipal) sector;
- start-up funds be made available to non-profit (private-not-for-profit and municipal) groups wishing to run a centre;
- because the need is so great, increased capital funding should be provided to non-profit groups (private-not-for-profit and municipal) for construction and renovation in order to expand services;

- the government should be looking at creative financing to assist with the development of new non-profit child care centres. Such programs as loan guarantees would be appropriate;
- a community development program should be established to assist groups wishing to start a non-profit child care centre. Assistance would consist of technical, financial, and legal advice on the operation of a centre. The program would include making Ministry consultants available to interested groups and providing funding to community-based non-profit organizations with such expertise.

## 2) Municipal Role

In recognition that municipally run centres have some of the highest quality child care, the Committee recommends the following:

- the government should encourage municipalities to take advantage of the cost-sharing arrangements available to them in order to finance new child care spaces. The Committee recognizes that this is not financially possible for some municipalities and feels that the province could look at ways in which it could assist with supplementary funding;
- the government should explore mechanisms in which municipalities with a lower commercial/industrial tax base could receive program-specific assistance for those spaces that are subsidized.

## Affordability

If parents can find child care for their children, the cost of that care may often be prohibitive. A report prepared for the federal Special Committee on Child Care estimated the 1986 cost of licensed centre care was \$5,419 annually for infants and \$4,135 annually for pre-schoolers.<sup>16</sup> At present, parents can claim a tax deduction of up to \$2,000 per child age 14 and under for child care expenses.

According to the DNIS, 17,896 children are subsidized of a total 82,280 (21.7%). (See Tables 2 and 5) It is likely that the number is higher, however, due to the system's previously discussed input problems.

In Ontario, only those families determined to be "in need" through a needs test can qualify for subsidy. Thus, licensed child care services in Ontario are affordable for those parents who can pay full fees and those parents at the lower end of the income scale who can obtain partial or full subsidies. For those parents in between, the cost of licensed child care is often out of reach.

According to a study by economist Monica Townson, the after tax income level in Ontario for two parents with two children was \$18,672 for full subsidy and \$22,632 for partial subsidy in 1983. (See Table 10)

One way in which costs to parents could be lowered would be to reduce fees. The Committee does not feel this is appropriate if staff wages would also be lowered. In fact, the Committee would like to see an improvement in the salaries and benefits of child care workers but not if it means passing on the higher costs of care to the parents.

### Recommendations

The Committee recommends that:

- the government should move, as quickly as possible, from needs testing to income testing as a less intrusive way of determining need for subsidies and as a method that would allow a greater number of people to receive assistance;
- in the interim, in recognition that the government is not using the current subsidy provisions under the Canada Assistance Plan to their fullest, the government should move substantially towards the maximum income levels allowable for subsidy under CAP;



- the government should expand the number of subsidized spaces as quickly as possible;
- direct grants be made available to both the non-profit sector and the existing for-profit sector in the child care system in Ontario;
- the government should provide incentives to commercial child care operators who would like to convert to non-profit status.

### Quality of Care

The question of quality care is a difficult one to quantify. The needs of children and parents vary, thus the kind of care given one particular child is not necessarily appropriate for another. The focus of much of the discussion during the Committee's public hearings was on what constitutes quality care and who can best provide it?

The working definition of quality child care used by the Task Force on Child Care was as follows:

care provided by knowledgeable, committed and sensitive care givers in a milieu that supports their efforts to provide an optimal environment designed to foster children's well-being, development and competence...explicitly recognizing the needs of parents for caregiving that supports and strengthens their child-rearing efforts through effective and informative communication and mutual respect.<sup>18</sup>

In attempting to define quality more specifically, there are a number of generally accepted measures used. These include:

#### 1) Staff/Child Ratios and Group-Size

- higher ratios (more children per staff member) are associated with lower quality care "because of the decreasing ability of the staff to provide each child with the necessary amount of individual attention."<sup>19</sup>

- small groups are important for individualized attention which will "encourage appropriate development of independence, self-assertion, problem-solving, co-operation and friendliness in children."<sup>20</sup>
- 2) Care-Giver Consistency
    - important that the same people are providing care over a period of time.
  - 3) Care-Giver Qualifications and Working Environment
    - good working conditions (reasonable wages and benefits) contribute to lower staff turnover and higher staff morale.
  - 4) Parent Involvement
    - children's developmental gains are thought to be "strengthened when child care programs involve parents, and when there is consistency between home and centre environments."<sup>21</sup>
  - 5) Physical Environment
    - the size, design, and layout of the centre, along with the availability of materials and equipment are thought to influence children's enjoyment and development.
  - 6) Regulatory Environment
    - important that the minimum standards are laid out in regulations and that they are enforced.

Although there are many questions falling under the issue of quality, the Committee by the nature of its mandate focused on whether or not there is a difference between the organization and/or operation of commercial and non-profit child care centres. Furthermore, if there are such differences, do they affect the quality of care provided?

## **Review of Available Literature**

The following section surveys the available literature on these questions. It is important to note that there is very little data on quality differentials between non-profit and commercial care programs and that the limited number of studies available often contain problems in the research methodology.

The key issues addressed in the literature are:

### **1) Staff/Child Ratios and Group Size**

One of the few studies available that compares the actual staff/child ratios and group size in non-profit and commercial centres is an American survey done by the National Council of Jewish Women in 1972.<sup>22</sup> The observational methods "were not methodologically sound by today's standards, however, the conceptualization at which the National Council arrived of the differences between for-profit and non-profit child-care is an important one."<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, although the data is 15 years old, the overall lack of data in this area necessitates its use.

With reference to staff/child ratios, the National Council found that 34% of the non-profit centres had staff/child ratios of 1:1 – 1:5 compared with 7% of the commercial centres.

(It should be noted that non-profit includes some government run centres in this study.) 75% of the non-profits fall between ratios of 1:1 – 1:5 and 1:6 – 1:9 compared with 45% of the commercial centres. (See Table 11)

With reference to group size, the National Council found that commercial centres had smaller average group sizes (26% of commercial centres had 10 or fewer in a group as compared to 23% of non-profits) but that they also had more centres with larger groups (6% of commercial centres had groups with 30 or more children as compared to 1% of non-profit centres.) (See Table 12)

Other American studies indicate similar results; for-profit programs were likely to have higher staff/child ratios.<sup>24</sup>

At present, it appears there are no Canadian data which addresses the question of differing ratios in commercial and non-profit care. In a recent survey of child care consultants across the country by SPR Associates for the federal Special Committee, participants were asked to rate the child care centres in their province.

The SPR survey of child care consultants (centres were not visited) used the following ratings on a scale of 1 through 5:

- 1) very poor – the centre is extremely deficient, in violation of important provincial standards;
- 2) poor – the centre falls short of some provincial standards;
- 3) adequate – the centre meets provincial standards and reasonable criteria for quality of care;
- 4) good – the centre provides quality somewhat better than provincial standards require;
- 5) excellent – the centre provides quality much better than provincial standards require.

Thus, the lower the ratings, the poorer the quality of care as evaluated by consultants. The ratings provided are for types of centres across Canada and were not separated by Province. Furthermore, the ratings were based on each province's standards and not on a uniform standard across the country.

Note that the following are evaluative ratings and not actual staff/child ratios.<sup>25</sup>

SPR Consultants' Survey, 1986

<u>Auspice</u>	<u>Staff/Child Ratios</u>	<u>Group Size</u>
Government	3.73	3.91
Non-Profit	3.71	3.49
Small For-Profit	3.17	3.21
Chain	2.67	2.89

## 2) Care-Giver Qualifications and Working Environment

Two recent Canadian studies have been completed on the education levels, wages and working conditions of child care workers. The first study, done for the federal Task Force on Child Care, surveyed 279 child care workers across the country. The second, done by the Hamilton Branch of the Association for Early Childhood Education surveyed 177 child care workers in the municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. In comparing figures from these studies, it is important to note that non-profit in the Hamilton study has been defined as "any formally constituted program which is not in the commercial sector;<sup>26</sup> therefore, municipal centres are included in this category.

### i) Education Levels

Both studies found that the majority of child care workers (56.6% in the federal study and 57.4% in the Hamilton study) had a two-year diploma in early childhood education. (These figures were not broken down by type of centre.) (See Table 13)

### ii) Wages

Both studies found that hourly wages varied according to the type of sponsorship of a centre and whether or not a centre was unionized. Commercial centres paid the lowest hourly wage (\$5.47 in the federal study and \$5.49 in the Hamilton study). (See Table 14)



On average the federal study, whose figures were not separated by province, found that "staff in commercial centres earn 30% less than those in non-profit centres and 50% less than staff in municipal centres." Furthermore, unionized staff earn 30% more than their non-unionized counterparts.<sup>27</sup>

### iii) Working Conditions/Benefits

The federal study found that a significant number of child care workers received little in the way of benefits and those workers in municipal centres received more benefits than either non-profit or commercial centres. (See Table 15)

## 3) Care-Giver Consistency

Research has found that staff turnover (most likely due to the low wages and lack of benefits cited above) is a constant problem for all types of centres. The federal study noted that 61% of workers surveyed were employed in their current centres for less than a year but were in the field for more than a year and that the average turnover rate was 17%.<sup>28</sup> The Hamilton study noted that the average length of time with present employer for non-profit centres was 3.5 years and for commercial centres averaged 3.5 years of experience. It concluded, "it is not encouraging to note that (on average) we have a picture of staff who have been in the field for 5.8 years and have had 2.5 employers."<sup>29</sup>

## 4) Parental Involvement

Non-profit child care centres usually have parent representatives on their Boards of Directors (provincial legislation does not specify the make-up of Boards). According to the SPR survey done for the federal Special Committee, commercial centres "generally lack this formal mechanism for input from parents, instead relying – where they are interested in real input – on less formal mechanisms."<sup>30</sup>

Moreover, one of the issues raised during public hearings of the Select Committee was that it is possible for a non-profit centre to set up a board consisting of the operator's family members and not involving parents.

The SPR survey obtained ratings on parental involvement as one of its quality indicators:<sup>31</sup>

Government	- 3.27
Non-Profit	- 3.37
Small For-Profit	- 2.83
Chain	- 2.56

#### 5) Physical Environment

To date, there are very little Canadian data on the physical aspects of different types of child care centres. The SPR survey also used physical environment as a quality indicator:<sup>32</sup>

Government	- 4.18
Non-Profit	- 3.37
Small For-Profit	- 3.24
Chain	- 3.33

#### 6) Regulatory Environment

Because inspection data is not collected centrally in Ontario, it is not possible to compare regulatory compliance between non-profit and commercial centres.

### General Ratings on Quality

The American study undertaken by the National Council of Jewish Women rated the centres which were observed as superior, good, fair and poor. It found a marked difference between non-profit and commercial centres as follows:<sup>33</sup>

#### Percent Distribution By Impression of Quality of Care By Auspice

<u>Ratings</u>	<u>Non-Profit Centres</u>	<u>Commercial Centres</u>
Superior	9.3%	1.0%
Good	28.2%	14.5%
Fair	51.1%	35.0%
Poor	11.4%	49.5%

In comparison, the SPR survey found:

#### Global Ratings of Centres By Auspice<sup>34</sup>

<u>Auspice</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Government	0%	2%	18%	46%	34%
Non-Profit	2%	9%	40%	33%	17%
Small-Profit	6%	19%	43%	22%	10%
Chain	0%	15%	56%	29%	0%

Furthermore, the SPR study made the following observations:

- on average, government centres provide the best care, with four-fifths as better than adequate and only one rated poor;
- non-profit centres provide better care on average than small for-profit centres. Half of the non-profit centres are rated better than adequate while only about one-third of the small for-profit are so rated. Conversely, only one tenth of the non-profits are rated below adequate while almost one-quarter of the small for-profits were so rated. On the other hand, the spread of quality is significant for both auspices;

- the chain centres have the largest percentage providing adequate care (meeting the minimum provincial standards.) The claim made by chain operators that they can maintain uniform quality standards seems to be supported, although their care is not at a very high level. The spread of quality in the chains is the lowest of all groups;
- despite regulation, a significant number of centres (except government) of all auspices are reported not to meet regulatory standards.

In sum, evidence in the literature (as limited as it is) indicates that commercial centres provide lower quality care than non-profit or government centres as measured by staff/child ratios, group size, staff salaries and benefits, staff turnover and parental involvement.

### Recommendations

After reviewing the evidence in the literature and that presented during the public hearings, the Committee recognizes there are a number of mechanisms which ensure quality child care in all types of centres. The Committee recommends the following:

- **staff/child ratios:** centres must meet the minimum standards as set out in the Day Nurseries Act with properly trained staff (ECE diploma or equivalent), (e.g. a cook should not be included in the teacher/child ratios);
- in recognition of the importance of child care work, good salaries and benefits should be paid to child care workers in order to attract good people to the field, to foster a good working environment in the centres and to decrease staff turnover;

- in recognition that significant participation by parents acts as a form of quality control, operators must have a mechanism for parental involvement in the operation of their centres as follows:

non-profit centres: parents must be mandated to have majority control on the centres' boards;

municipal centres: must have parent advisory committees;

commercial centres: should be encouraged to establish parent advisory committees;

- these mechanisms for parental involvement should become part of the inspection process. Thus, during each inspection (re-licensing or unannounced) inspectors would discuss formal parental involvement in the centre with the operator;
- regular flow of information regarding the centre's activities, standards, inspection reports etc. between the operator and all parents.



## COMMITTEE HEARINGS



The following arguments were presented to the Committee during its public hearings from March 23, 1987 to April 10, 1987.

#### Arguments Against Funding of Commercial Operators

- the commercial sector is less likely to provide quality care than the non-profit sector as the profit motive necessitates less money being spent on the operation of a child care centre.
- in a non-profit centre, all income (parents fees and public dollars) is used to operate the centre, whereas in a commercial centre a portion of that income is taken out of the centre in the form of a "profit."
- commercial centres pay lower salaries and less benefits to their employees thereby contributing to high staff turnover and low morale. It is felt that this contributes to lower quality child care.
- although commercial centres must meet the standards in the Day Nurseries Act, these are the minimum standards required and commercial centres are less likely to exceed them than are non-profit centres.
- commercial centres are not required to have a community-based board to oversee the operation of the centre and therefore have less public accountability and parent involvement in the centre. Furthermore, there is no mechanism for complaint or appeal by employees other than to the owner/operator.
- commercial centres are opposed to increased regulation and higher regulatory standards in the child care system.
- direct grants to the commercial sector will expand the commercial sector over time.

### **Arguments in Favour of Funding to Commercial Operators**

- commercial operators can offer services at less cost than non-profit or government centres as they provide their own capital.
- commercial operators contribute to the system through business taxes (which non-profit organizations do not have to pay).
- commercial centres are more efficient, better managed and more flexible (e.g. more flexible hours) than non-profit or government centres.
- commercial centres help meet consumer demand by increasing the supply of available spaces, increasing the number of options available to parents and creating competition in the market, thereby ensuring higher quality of care.
- parents should have a choice between government operated, non-profit and commercial centres.
- quality of care in all types of centres varies with some being excellent and some being poor.

### **Recommendations Presented To The Committee During Public Hearings**

The Committee notes that not all of the following recommendations are within the Committee's mandate, and therefore, have not been discussed in the Committee's report.

#### **Funding**

##### **1) Direct Grants**

- direct grants should be paid to all licensed child care centres to be cost shared between the federal and provincial governments (suggestion was 30% of the present per diem).

- direct grants should be paid to all licensed non-profit centres.
- commercial operators should be eligible for the direct grant for a period of 3 – 5 years. At the end of the period, these operators would be expected to become non-profit organizations in order to receive public funding.
- commercial centres should be allowed to operate but without public funding (similar to the existence of private schools within the public educational system).
- direct grants to centres to raise the salaries of child care workers should go directly to the worker and not to the operator.
- increased capital and start-up grants be provided to non-profit organizations to develop new centres.

## 2) Purchase of Service Agreements

- commercial sector should only receive subsidies for low-income people.
- purchase of service agreements should remain but without the 10% "profit" component allowed at present.
- existing agreements with the commercial sector should be phased out as more non-profit spaces become available.
- no new purchase of service agreements with commercial operators.

## 3) Cost-Sharing

- provincial government should not change the definition of approved agency under the Canada Assistance Plan to include the commercial sector.
- cost of child care should be divided between government and parents on an 80:20 basis with the federal and provincial levels of government splitting the government share equally.



#### 4) Subsidy Arrangements

- change subsidy system so that subsidies could be given based on income. For example, any one earning \$30,000 annually could be eligible for a subsidy based on a sliding scale. People earning over \$30,000 could receive tax credits up to a maximum amount. People earning over that maximum amount would be solely responsible for their child care fees.

#### Conversion of Commercial Centres to Non-Profit Centres

- program be instituted to assist commercial operators in their conversion to non-profit status – workshops, legal assistance, advice and consultation etc.
- require all charitable and non-charitable corporations to establish boards of directors with parent representatives (suggestions ranged from 1/3 to 1/2 parental representatives).
- transition period of 3–5 years be established in which commercial operators receive government money until such time as they become non-profit.

#### Compensation for Commercial Operators

- provincial government should develop a plan to buy out existing commercial operations converting them into non-profit organizations.
- provincial government should make available low-interest loans to non-profit organizations to buy existing commercial operations.
- commercial operators who do not wish to convert to non-profit status should be compensated financially (suggestion was at the rate of \$1,000 per child space).

### Development Assistance for Non-Profit Organizations

- provincial government should establish non-profit development corporations in various regions to provide technical expertise to parents and community groups wishing to establish non-profit child care services.
- establish funds to assist non-profit resource groups to assist parent groups in establishing child care programs.
- development unit to assist and encourage municipalities to create child care programs, require child care space as a condition of development in the municipality and encourage municipalities to remove restrictive zoning by-laws.

### Improvement of Current Child Care Regulations

- the Day Nurseries Act be reviewed and revised in order that higher minimum standards of care be established in Ontario.
- "loopholes" in the legislation should be tightened to prevent misuse of the funds given to all child care centres.
- more consultants should be hired and the consultative side of their role should be expanded.
- a central database should be created to keep track of the number of inspections, violations, follow-ups done each year.
- inspection reports should be posted in the centre for parents to see and sent to the provincial government.
- important regulations such as staff/child ratios, group size, the number of required ECE graduates etc. should be posted in the centre for parents to see.
- the DNIS should be refined in order to give a more accurate picture as to the number of spaces within the commercial sector.
- Province should introduce a provincial Child Care Act and work with the Federal Government towards developing a National Child Care Act.

### Private Home Child Care

- improved funding of home-care wages.
- development of more home care services as an alternative to licensed group care.
- improved standards for licensed agencies and providers.

### Proposals for a New Ministry

- a Ministry of Early Childhood Education should be established to oversee, regulate, license and administer child care.
- a "super ministry" should be established to deal with child advocacy with a meshing of responsibilities from the Ministries of Education, Community and Social Services, and Labour.

### Miscellaneous

- establish a unit within the Ministry of Community and Social Services to work with other Ministries to encourage the establishment of child care programs.
- expansion of subsidized spaces at the rate of 15,000 per annum.
- fund and expand training programs for child care workers and introduce upgrading courses and professional development.
- implement a system of accreditation (such as in health and post-secondary institutions) for public and voluntary centres.
- zoning, tax and other incentives should be provided to encourage work place child care and favourable consideration should be given to corporations that permit employees to use other child care options (flexible work hours).
- more appropriate family support should be given in terms of parental leaves and job sharing.

- improve parenting and life skills programs in secondary schools.
- secondary schools should arrange for the provision of child care for the use of students for their children and for the use of the community.
- before and after school child care programs should be expanded in elementary schools.





### SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS



The following lists the recommendations made by the Select Committee on Health in its examination of non-profit and commercial child care in Ontario.

### Accountability

- all licensed centres that receive any public funding shall be required to report all financial information to the Ministry and shall be required to post financial information publicly on the premises in the same way as provided in the Nursing Home Amendment Act.

### Inspections

- the creation of a central database containing the number of inspections (re-licensing inspections, unannounced visits and those inspections resulting from a complaint), violations of the Day Nurseries Act, follow-up procedures and any fines or charges laid for each child care centre in Ontario.
- the separation of the inspection/enforcement role of a Ministry inspector from the consultative/advisory role of a Ministry inspector.
- the hiring of more inspectors in recognition of the separation of responsibilities.
- the undertaking of more inspections without notice.
- the posting of inspection reports in each child care centre.
- the posting of basic regulations in each child care centre to be seen by parents and other interested parties, i.e. staff:child ratios, staff qualifications, space allocations and other regulations the Ministry feels are the most significant.
- the provision of a written service contract between child care operators and parents detailing the basic regulations for standards of care and expectations of the operator and the parent(s).

### Expansion of Child Care Spaces

- the government should undertake an expansion of the number of spaces in the existing child care system in Ontario and that this should occur in the non-profit (private-not-for-profit and municipal) sector.
- start-up funds be made available to non-profit (private-not-for-profit and municipal) groups wishing to run a centre.
- because the need is so great, increased capital funding should be provided to non-profit groups (private-not-for-profit and municipal) for construction and renovation in order to expand services.
- the government should be looking at creative financing to assist with the development of new non-profit child care centres. Such programs as loan guarantees would be appropriate.
- a community development program should be established to assist groups wishing to start a non-profit child care centre. Assistance would consist of technical, financial, and legal advice on the operation of a centre. The program would include making Ministry consultants available to interested groups and providing funding to community-based non-profit organizations with such expertise.

### Municipal Role

- the government should encourage municipalities to take advantage of the cost-sharing arrangements available to them in order to finance new child care spaces. The Committee recognizes that this is not financially possible for some municipalities and feels that the province could look at ways in which it could assist with supplementary funding.

- the government should explore mechanisms in which municipalities with a lower commercial/industrial tax base could receive program-specific assistance for those spaces that are subsidized.

### Affordability

- the government should move, as quickly as possible, from needs testing to income testing as a less intrusive way of determining need for subsidies and as a method that would allow a greater number of people to receive assistance.
- in the interim, in recognition that the government is not using the current subsidy provisions under the Canada Assistance Plan to their fullest, the government should move substantially towards the maximum income levels allowable for subsidy under CAP.
- the government should expand the number of subsidized spaces as quickly as possible.
- direct grants be made available to both the non-profit sector and the existing for-profit sector in the child care system in Ontario.
- the government should provide incentives to commercial child care operators who would like to convert to non-profit status.

### Quality of Care

- staff/child ratios: centres must meet the minimum standards as set out in the Day Nurseries Act with properly trained staff (ECE diploma or equivalent), (e.g. a cook should not be included in the teacher/child ratios).
- in recognition of the importance of child care work, good salaries and benefits should be paid to child care workers in order to attract good people to the field, to foster a good working environment in the centres and to decrease staff turnover.



- in recognition that significant participation by parents acts as a form of quality control, operators must have a mechanism for parental involvement in the operation of their centres as follows:

non-profit centres: parents must be mandated to have majority control on the centres' boards;

municipal centres: must have parent advisory committees;

commercial centres: should be encouraged to establish parent advisory committees.

- these mechanisms for parental involvement should become part of the inspection process. Thus, during each inspection (re-licensing or unannounced) inspectors would discuss formal parental involvement in the centre with the operator.
- regular flow of information regarding the centre's activities, standards, inspection reports etc. between the operator and all parents.

## TABLES



**Table 1:     Number of Licensed Day Nurseries and Market Share in Ontario  
by Auspice, 1980-1986**

	PFP	Market Share	PNFP	Market Share	Public	Market Share	IUG	Market Share	Total
Dec 1980	658	40.5%	644	39.6%	164	10.1%	159	9.8%	1,625
March 1981	728	43.9%	602	36.3%	165	9.9%	164	9.9%	1,659
March 1982	742	42.0%	700	39.6%	168	9.5%	157	8.9%	1,767
March 1983	786	41.3%	787	41.3%	168	8.8%	163	8.6%	1,904
March 1984	792	41.0%	835	43.2%	164	8.5%	140	7.3%	1,931
March 1985	839	41.5%	890	44.0%	165	8.2%	127	6.3%	2,021
March 1986	879	41.6%	947	44.9%	173	8.2%	112	5.3%	2,111
Dec 1986	920	41.3%	1,020	45.8%	173	7.8%	113	5.1%	2,226
Total Change	262	0.8%	376	6.2%	9	-2.3%	-46	-4.7%	601
Total % Change	39.8%	2.0%	58.4%	15.7%	5.5%	-22.8%	-28.9%	-48%	37%

PFP:     private-for-profit

PNFP:   private-not-for-profit

Public:   municipal facilities

IUG:     individual for an unincorporated group

Source:   Ministry of Community and Social Services, DNIS, December 1986.

**Table 2:     Number of Licensed Spaces and Market Share in Ontario by  
Auspice, 1980-1986**

	PFP	Market Share	PNFP	Market Share	Public	Market Share	IUG	Market Share	Total
Dec 1980	26,746	44.3%	20,926	34.7%	7,905	13.1%	4,769	7.9%	60,346
Mar 1981	28,979	47.0	19,698	32.0	7,993	13.0	4,923	8.0	61,593
Mar 1982	29,671	45.3	23,021	35.1	8,370	12.8	4,491	6.9	65,553
Mar 1983	31,250	44.8	25,652	36.8	8,300	11.9	4,575	6.6	69,777
Mar 1984	31,190	44.4	27,033	38.5	8,128	11.6	3,933	5.6	70,284
Mar 1985	33,832	45.5	28,837	38.8	8,223	11.1	3,392	4.6	74,284
Mar 1986	35,616	45.5	31,036	39.7	8,435	10.8	3,131	4.0	78,218
Dec 1986	37,023	45.0	33,686	40.9	8,387	10.2	3,184	3.9	82,280
Total Change	10,277	0.7	12,760	6.2	482	-2.9	-1,585	-4.0	21,934
Total % Change	38.4%	1.6%	61%	17.9%	6.1%	-22.1%	-33.2%	-50.6%	36.3%
PFP:	private-for-profit								
PNFP:	private-not-for-profit								
Public:	municipal centres								
IUG:	individual for an unincorporated group								

Source: Ministry of Community and Social Services, DNIS, December 1986.



**Table 3:     Average Capacity of Facilities in Ontario by Auspice, 1980-1986**

	<b>PFP</b>	<b>PNFP</b>	<b>Public</b>	<b>IUG</b>	<b>Overall</b>
Dec 1980	40.6	32.5	48.2	30.0	37.1
March 1981	39.8	32.7	48.4	30.0	37.1
March 1982	38.3	32.9	49.8	28.6	37.1
March 1983	39.8	32.6	49.4	28.1	36.6
March 1984	39.4	32.4	49.6	28.1	36.4
March 1985	40.3	32.4	49.8	26.7	36.8
March 1986	40.5	32.8	48.8	28.0	37.1
Dec 1986	40.2	33.0	48.5	28.2	37.0
Total Change	-0.4	0.5	0.3	-1.8	-0.1
Total % Change	-1.0	1.5	0.6	-6.0	-0.3

PFP:     private-for-profit  
 PNFP:   private-not-for-profit  
 Public:   municipal centres  
 IUG:     individual for an unincorporated group

Source:    Ministry of Community and Social Services, DNIS, December 1986.

**Table 4: Full-Time Enrolment and Part-Time Enrolment by Auspice, 1980 and 1986**

	Total Enrolment	Full-Time Enrolment	% of Total Full-Time	Part-Time Enrolment	% of Total Part-Time
<b>PFP</b>					
1980	29,513	13,503	47.2%	16,010	40.8%
1986	43,885	18,727	47.7%	25,158	43.1%
Change	14,372	5,224	0.5%	9,148	2.3
% Change	48.7%	38.7%	1.1%	57.1%	5.6%
<b>PNFP</b>					
1980	23,564	7,709	26.9%	15,855	40.4%
1986	40,386	14,078	35.8%	26,308	45.1%
Change	16,822	6,369	8.9	10,453	4.7
% Change	71.4%	82.6%	33.1%	65.9%	11.6%
<b>PUBLIC</b>					
1980	8,826	5,932	20.7%	2,894	7.4%
1986	9,357	5,631	14.3%	3,726	6.4%
Change	531	-301	-6.4	832	-1.0
% Change	6.0%	-5.1%	-30.9%	28.7%	-13.5%
<b>IUG</b>					
1980	5,192	1,463	5.1%	4,449	11.3%
1986	3,994	844	2.1%	3,150	5.4%
Change	-1,918	-619	-3.0%	-1,299	-5.9
% Change	-32.4%	-42.3%	-58.8%	-29.2%	-52.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>					
1980	67,815	28,607	% of Total 42.2%	39,208	% of Total 57.8%
1986	97,622	39,280	40.2%	58,342	59.8%
Change			-2.0		2.0
% Change	44.0%	37.3%	-1.9%	48.8%	3.3%

PFP: private-for-profit

PNFP: private-not-for-profit

Public: municipal centres

IUG: individual for an unincorporated group

Source: Ministry of Community and Social Services, DNIS, October 1980 and July 1986.

**Table 5:     Subsidized Children in Full-Time and Part-Time Enrolment in Ontario by Auspice, 1986**

<u>Operator Type</u>	<u>Total Subsidized Enrolment</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Full-Time Enrolment</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Part-Time Enrolment</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
<u>Not-for-Profit</u>						
Approved Charitable Handicapped:	633	3.5	211	1.2	422	2.4
Charitable Corporation:	4,380	24.5	3,551	19.9	829	4.6
Approved Charitable:	1,564	8.8	999	5.6	565	3.2
Indian Band:	496	2.8	288	1.6	208	1.2
TOTAL PNFP:	7,073	39.6	5,049	28.3	2,024	11.4
<u>For-Profit</u>						
Non-Charitable:	4,381	24.5	3,963	22.2	418	
Private Individual:	1,276	7.1	1,096	6.1	180	1.0
TOTAL PFP:	5,657	31.6	5,059	28.3	598	3.3
<u>Public</u>						
Municipal Corporation:	4,951	27.7	1,225	6.9	3,726	20.8
TOTAL:	4,951	27.7	1,225	6.9	3,726	20.8
<u>Other</u>						
Individual For An Unincorporated Group:	175	1.0	98	0.5	77	0.4
TOTAL:	175	1.0	98	0.5	77	0.4
GRAND TOTAL:	17,856	100.0	11,431	64.0	6,425	35.9

Source:     Compiled from Day Nurseries Information System, July 1986.

**Table 6: Age Distribution of Children in Ontario by Auspice, 1986**

[illegible]

Table 7:

Licensed Day Nurseries - Expenditures in Ontario, 1976/77 - 1986/87

	Regular Day Care (Ms)	Handicapped Day Care (Ms)	Total Day Care (Ms)	% Change	Total Day Care As % of Ministry Expenditures	Ministry of Community and Social Services Expenditures	Total Day Care Expenditure Constant \$s (1981=100)	% Change
76/77	25	4	29	-	2.8%	1,036	46,104,928.45	-
77/78	30	5	35	20.7	3.1%	1,137	51,546,391.75	11.8
78/79	33	5	38	8.6	3.1%	1,228	51,420,838.97	-0.2
79/80	36	6	42	10.5	3.1%	1,345	52,044,609.66	1.2
80/81	43	7	50	19.0	3.3%	1,528	56,242,969.62	8.1
81/82	51	9	60	20.0	3.4%	1,772	60,000,000.00	6.7
82/83	63	11	74	23.3	3.5%	2,125	66,787,003.61	11.3
83/84	69	12	81	9.5	3.4%	2,403	69,112,627.98	3.5
84/85	74	13	87	7.4	3.3%	2,604	71,136,549.46	2.9
85/86	94	12	106	49.3	3.7%	2,872	83,333,333.33	17.1
86/87	131	12	143	34.9	4.7%	3,066	108,006,042.20	29.6
Total %	424.0%	200.0%	393.1%		66.6%	195.9%		134.3%
Change 76/77 to 86/87								
Average annual change			20.32%					9.2%

Source: Compiled from Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Estimates - Briefing Books, 1978/79 - 1986/87 and Ontario, Ministry of Treasury and Economics, Public Accounts, 1977/78 - 1985-86.



**Table 8:**     Number of Staff Required for a Day Nursery in Ontario, 1986  
 (other than a Day Nursery for Handicapped Children)

<u>Age of Children in Group</u>	<u>Ratio of Employees:Children</u>	<u>Maximum Number of Children in a Group</u>
Under 18 months	3:10	10
18 months – 30 months	1:5	15
30 months – 5 years	1:8	16
5 years – 6 years	1:12	24
6 years – 9 years	1:15	30

\* The maximum room capacity is the same as the group size in each category except for 30 months – 5 years, for which the maximum room capacity is 24.

Source:    Ministry of Community and Social Services, Day Nurseries: Highlights of the Legislation (Toronto: The Ministry, 1986):4.

Table 9: Private Home Child Care Agencies and Spaces in Ontario, 1985

<u>Type of Agency</u>	<u># of Agencies</u>	<u>Enrolment</u>
Commercial	9 (16.7%)	309 (4.8%)
Municipal (Public)	19 (35.7%)	3189 (49.8%)
Non-Profit	25 (46.3%)	2809 (43.9%)
Indian Band	<u>1 (1.9%)</u>	<u>10 (0.2%)</u>
Total	54	6398

Source: Telephone interview with Ms Heather Barker, Child Care Branch,  
Ministry of Community and Social Services, Toronto, 7 April 1987.

**Table 10: Income Turning Points Under CAP to Determine Likelihood of Need, Ontario, 1983 and 1986**

**Two Parents, Two Children**

<u>Full Subsidy Up to This Point</u>				<u>Partial Subsidy Ends</u>		
After-tax Income		Gross Income Annual		After-tax Income		Gross Income Annual
Monthly	Annual			Monthly	Annual	
1983 1556	18,672	20,132		1886	22,632	25,248

**Single Parent, Two Children**

1983 1368	16,416	18,410		1698	20,376	23,861
-----------	--------	--------	--	------	--------	--------

Source: Monica Townson, "Financing Child Care Through the Canada Assistance Plan." In *Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements* (Ottawa: Supply and Services, 1986): 27.

**Table 11: Percent Disbribution of Non-Profit and Commercial Centres By Staff/Child Ratio, 1972**

<b>Staff: Child Ratio</b>	<b><u>Non-profit Centres</u></b>	<b><u>Commercial Centres</u></b>
1:1 - 1:5	34%	7%
1:6 - 1:9	41%	38%
1:10 - 1:14	18%	39%
1:15 - 1:20	5%	11%
1:20 or more	2%	5%

**Source:** Mary Dublin Keyserling, Windows on Day Care. (New York: The National Council of Jewish Women, 1972.): 109.

Table 12: Percent Disbribution of Non-Profit and Commercial Centres By Average Group Size, 1972

<u>Average Group Size</u>	<u>Non-Profit Centres</u>	<u>Commercial Centres</u>
10 or fewer	23%	26%
11 - 14	18%	22%
15 - 20	49%	38%
21 - 29	9%	8%
30 and over	1%	6%

Source: Mary Dublin Keyserling, Windows on Day Care, (New York: The National Council of Jewish Women, 1972.): 108.



Table 13: Percent Disbribution by Levels of Education, 1986

<u>Highest Level of Education</u>	<u>Federal Study</u>	<u>Hamilton Study</u>
less than high school	0.8%	13.0% (grade 12 or less)
high school diploma	9.0%	1.1% (grade 13)
one year E.C.E. training	4.1%	
2 years E.C.E. graduate	56.6%	57.4%
more than 2 years E.C.E.	5.7%	5.1%
some university	9.8%	3.4% (degree)
BA, BSc, BSW	11.5%	11.4% (E.C.E. + degree)
some graduate work	0.0%	
MA	0.8%	
other	1.6%	1.7%
		(college diploma)

Source: Patti Schom-Moffatt, Wages and Working Conditions of Workers in the Formal Day Care Market, in Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements (Ottawa: Supply and Services, 1986) and

Association for Early Childhood Education, Regional Analysis of Canada's National Child Care Subsidy System. Salaries and Work Experience in the Municipality of Hamilton Wentworth (Hamilton: AECE, 1986).

**Table 14:    Average Hourly Wages By Auspice, 1986**

<u>Type of Centre</u>	<u>Federal Study</u>	<u>Hamilton Study</u>
non-profit	\$7.46	\$7.61
commercial	\$5.47	\$5.49
municipal	\$10.58	
union	\$9.90	\$8.77
non-union	\$6.63	\$7.31
all centres	\$7.29	\$7.44

Source: Patti Schom-Moffatt, "The Bottom Line: Wages and Working Conditions of Workers in the Formal Day Care Market," in Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements (Ottawa: Supply and Services, 1986) and Association for Early Childhood Education, Regional Analysis of Canada's National Child Care Subsidy System. Salaries and Work Experience in the Municipality of Hamilton Wentworth (Hamilton: AECE, 1986).

Table 15: Percent Distribution of Benefits Coverage by Auspice, 1986

<u>Benefits</u>	<u>Non-Profit</u>	<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Municipal</u>
<u>Health Coverage*</u>			
none	57.7%	68.9%	4.2%
partially paid	42.0%	4.9%	95.0%
fully paid		26.2%	
<u>Dental Coverage</u>			
none	69.9%	83.6%	8.3%
partially paid	23.7%	4.9%	50.1%
fully paid	6.4%	11.5%	41.7%
<u>Paid Sick Days</u>			
none	6.4%	70.5%	16.7%
less than 1 per month	23.1%	24.6%	4.2%
1-3 per month	70.5%	4.9%	79.2%
<u>Paid Vacation</u>			
none	2.6%	27.9%	4.2%
1 week a year	0	1.6%	4.2%
2 weeks a year	34.0%	60.7%	8.3%
2-4 weeks a year	58.3%	9.8%	79.2%
4 weeks a year	5.1%	0	4.2%
Pension Plan	12.8%	6.6%	97.5%
Life Insurance	34.0%	21.3%	83.3%
Paid Maternity Leave	23.1%	3.3%	79.2%
Workshops/ Conferences	29.4%	27.1%	54.2%

\* The figures in the published report did not add up for the section on health coverage. A telephone conversation with the author of the report resulted in the figures presented here. The 42% under the non-profit centres is for both the partially paid and fully paid coverage and the 95% under the municipal is also for both categories. Ms. Schom-Moffatt indicated, however, that the majority had full coverage paid for as a benefit of employment in the municipal centres.

Source: Patti Schom-Moffatt, "The Bottom Line: Wages and Working Conditions of Workers in the Formal Day Care Market," in Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements (Ottawa: Supply and Services, 1986).



### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Canada, Statistics Canada, The Labour Force, Cat. no. 71-001 (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, May 1982 and December 1986).

<sup>2</sup>R. Beaujot, "Dwindling Families," Policy Options - Options Politiques (September 1986): 4.

<sup>3</sup>Canada, Statistics Canada, Canada's Lone Parent Families, Cat No. 99-933 (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1984).

<sup>4</sup>Idem, Income Distributions by Size in Canada, Cat. no. 13-207 (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1986).

<sup>5</sup>Donna S. Lero et al., "Parents Needs, Preferences, and Concerns about Child Care: Case Studies of 336 Canadian Families, in Child Care Needs of Parents and Families, prepared as a report for the Task Force on Child Care (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1985).

<sup>6</sup>Canada Corporation Manual (Toronto: De Boo, looseleaf), p. 15-14.

<sup>7</sup>It should be noted that figures on the number of spaces in Ontario are not entirely clear. In view of the definitional problems associated with the DNIS categorization of operators, the Ontario Coalition for Better Day Care (OCBDC) presented a brief to the Committee using a different set of figures. The OCBDC searched corporate records to ascertain which of the non-charitable corporations were businesses incorporated under the Corporations Act and which were non-charitable, yet non-profit corporations. There numbers are as follows:

### SPACES

	<u>COMSOC</u>	<u>OCBDC</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Non-charitable Corporation	20,715	15,684	5,031
Private Individual	14,935	14,251	684
	35,650	29,935	5,715
<u>Other</u> Individual for an Unincorporated Group (Commercial spaces)	8,076	3,872	4,204
	43,726	33,807	9,919

<sup>8</sup>Monica Townson, "Financing Child Care Through the Canada Assistance Plan," in Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements, prepared as a background paper for the Task Force on Child Care, Series 1 (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1986), p.7.



<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Day Nurseries: Highlights of the Legislation (Toronto: The Ministry, 1986), pp. 1-3.

<sup>11</sup>Idem, Manual on Private Home Day Care (Toronto: The Ministry, 1984).

<sup>12</sup>This included single parents and both parents in two-parent families employed 20 hours or more each week, single parents attending school full-time, two-parent families with at least one parent attending school.

<sup>13</sup>Canada, Task Force on Child Care (Katie Cooke, Chair), Report (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1986), pp. 77-78.

<sup>14</sup>Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Special Committee on Child Care, Sharing the Responsibility (Ottawa: The Committee, 1987), p. 44.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>16</sup>E.E. Hobbs & Associates Ltd., Review of Child Care Fees (Ottawa: Special Committee on Child Care, House of Commons, Parliament, 1986), p. 14.

<sup>17</sup>The federal special parliamentary committee recommended that the existing deduction be replaced by a child care expense credit of up to 30% of expenses, not to exceed \$3,000 per child age 14 and under and \$12,000 per family.

<sup>18</sup>Task Force, p. 129.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 130

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 132.

<sup>22</sup>Mary Dublin Keyserling, Windows on Day Care (New York: National Council of Jewish Women, 1972).

<sup>23</sup>Martha Friendly, Day Care For-Profit: Where Does The Money Go? brief presented to the Special Committee on Child Care (Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, 1986), p. 12.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>25</sup>SPR Associates Inc., An Exploratory Review of Selected Issues in For-Profit Versus Not-for-Profit Child Care (Toronto: SPR Associates Inc./National Mail Surveys Inc., 1986), p. 24.

<sup>26</sup>Association for Early Childhood Education (Hamilton Branch), A Regional Analysis of Canada's National Child Care Subsidy System: Salaries and Work Experience in the Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth (Hamilton: A.E.C.E., 1986), p. 3.

<sup>27</sup>Patti Schom-Moffatt, "The Bottom Line: Wages and Working Conditions of Workers in the Formal Day Care Market," in Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1986).



<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>29</sup>Association for Early Childhood Education, p. 8.

<sup>30</sup>SPR Associates Inc., p. 8.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

<sup>33</sup>Keyserling, p. 120.

<sup>34</sup>SPR Associates Inc., p. 21.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Association for Early Childhood Education. (Hamilton Branch). A Regional Analysis of Canada's National Child Care Subsidy System: Salaries and Work Experience in the Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. Hamilton: A.E.C.E., 1986.
- Bates, Hélène Blais. "Day Care Standards in Canada." In Child Care Standards and Quality. Prepared as a background paper for the Task Force on Child Care, Series 3. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1985.
- Blain, Christine. "Government Spending on Child Care in Canada." In Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements. Prepared as a background paper for the Task Force on Child Care, Series 1. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1985.
- Canada. Task Force on Child Care (Katie Cooke, Chair). Report. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1986.
- Coelen, Craig, Glantz, Frederic and Calde, Daniel. Day Care Centres in the U.S.: A National Profile 1976-1977. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates Inc., 1979.
- Friendly, Martha. Day Care For-Profit: Where Does the Money Go? Brief presented to the Special Committee on Child Care. Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, 1986.
- Howes, Carollee. "Caregiver Behavior in Center and Family Day Care." Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology 4 (1983): 99-107.
- Howes, Carollee and Olenick, Michael. "Family and Child Care Influences on Toddlers' Compliance." Child Development 57 (1986).
- Kagan, Sharon and Glennon, Theresa. "Considering Proprietary Child Care." In Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues. Edited by Edward F. Zigler and Edmund W. Gordon. Boston: Auburn House, 1982, pp. 402-412.
- Keyserling, Mary Dublin. Windows on Day Care. New York: National Council of Jewish Women, 1972.
- Krashinsky, Michael. Day Care and Public Policy in Ontario, Ontario Economic Council Research Studies 22. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- Lero, Donna S. and Kyle, Irene. "Day Care Quality: Its Definition and Implementation." In Child Care Standards and Quality. Prepared as a background paper for the Task Force on Child Care, Series 3. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1985.
- McCartney, Kathleen. "Effect of Day Care Environment on Children's Language Development." Developmental Psychology 20:2 (1984): 244-260.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(continued)

Schom-Moffatt, Patti. "The Bottom Line: Wages and Working Conditions in the Formal Day Care Market." In Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements. Prepared as a background paper for the Task Force on Child Care, Series 1. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1985.

SPR Associates Inc. An Exploratory Review of Selected Issues in For-Profit Versus Not-For-Profit Child Care. Toronto: SPR Associates Inc./National Mail Surveys Inc., 1986.

Thomson, Tamra L. "Municipal Initiatives in Child Care." In Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements. Prepared as a background paper for the Task Force on Child Care, Series 1. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1985.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. National Day Care Study. Final Report. Washington: The Department, 1979.

Whitebrook, Marcy et al. "Caring for the Care Givers: Staff Burnout in Childcare." In Current Topics in Early Childhood Education. Edited by Lilian Katz. Norwood: Ablex Press, 1982, pp. 211-235.

DISSENTING OPINION





Pursuant to Standing Order 110(c) Mr. Johnston and Mr. Cooke express a dissenting opinion from the recommendation of the Select Committee on Health regarding the commercialization of child care.

Ontario is facing a critical choice in the development of child care policy and services. For the first time in the history of child care in this province, the Ontario government has committed itself to direct funding of child care services.

This could represent a significant departure from current policy, wherein funding is restricted to subsidizing families in need and development of services is left to the marketplace. Direct funding could make a huge difference for working families in Ontario who desperately need quality, dependable child care that they can afford. But just how big a difference it will actually make depends on how the government proceeds.

Organizations and individuals concerned about child care have been telling governments for years that the only way to overcome the central problems in providing child care services – availability, affordability, quality and the low wages paid to staff – is to fund child care as a public service, like education or health care. New Democrats have been the only consistent voice in the legislature calling for this solution.

Child care is now on the agenda of both the federal and provincial governments. While the Ontario government has stated its intention to provide direct operating grants to child care centres, it wants to give the money not just to non-profit services, but to commercial enterprises as well.

Despite almost unanimous opposition to this plan by the witnesses who appeared before the Select Committee on Health, the Committee's majority report recommends that direct grants be made available to the existing for-profit sector in the child care system.

New Democrats fundamentally disagree with the government's approach and with this recommendation of the majority report. In our view, profit-making has no place in the care of young children. The goals of the private, commercial sector do not serve the goal of quality, affordable child care for working families.

This is not an issue of ideology or an issue of limited or passing significance.

The steps that are taken today with respect to child care will have a profound impact on the lives of families for generations to come. New Democrats are fighting for child care that is comprehensive, high quality, publicly supported, consistently delivered and available and affordable for all who wish it.

Child care services have always been underfunded in this province because the bulk of the funding has come from parent fees. The government's plan would divert scarce public funds to commercial operators at a time when the not-for-profit sector, which offers superior quality care, should be expanded to meet the need.

### Profit vs. Care

Commercially-operated child care centres are no different from other businesses: they are in business to make money. The Association of Day Care Operators in Ontario spelled this out themselves in a 1982 brief to the Ontario government:

"In addition to providing a quality service, the commercial sector pride themselves in being part of the free-enterprise system and strive to earn taxable profits which benefit the economy at large."

When tight budgets are strained by the additional requirement to make a profit, then something has to go. It does. Wages of staff and quality of service are sacrificed.

Evidence that the commercial sector provides care that is generally inferior to that provided by public and non-profit agencies is overwhelming. This has been the conclusion of studies done in Canada and the United States. While there are some good individual commercial operators, the sector as a whole provides poorer quality care. No matter what the criterion is, whether it is staff salaries, child/staff ratios, parental involvement, or attention to nutrition or programming, the commercial sector's performance is poor.

A recent study commissioned by the federal Committee on Child Care concluded that, "in general, non-profit care is likely to be higher in quality than for-profit care, and this superiority seems to hold up on virtually all measures..."

This was also the message from the parents, child care workers and their representatives who appeared before the Committee.

Witnesses told of abuses of staff/child ratios when commercial operators refused to hire substitute staff to replace staff on vacation or sick leave. Program supplies in some centres are so low that staff bring in their own toys and materials to provide activities for children. Food in some centres is so inadequate that children's nutritional needs are not being met.

Staff in commercial centres are paid about 30% less than those in voluntary non-profit programs and about 50% less than staff in municipally-operated centres. This results in high staff turnover, which in turn, lowers the quality of care.

#### Accountability and Parental Involvement

Accountability to parents and communities for funds and programming is fundamental. Parents and taxpayers have a bottom-line concern that quality of service be assured. And parental involvement in programming is a key determinant of quality of care.

But the commercial sector has made it clear that it does not want to be held accountable for funds or programming.

When the Association of Day Care Operators was asked at the Select Committee hearings to comment on a proposal requiring the submission and posting of annual profit-and-loss statements, its President, Jeff Smith replied:

"As far as posting them publicly, quite frankly, I do not feel that that is the public's right to know how a centre is operated."

The Select Committee also learned that commercially-operated centres usually have little parental involvement, whether through a formal mechanism, such as an advisory board or even informally, through regular parent/teacher meetings. The commercial sector also has a history of lobbying against improvements to the minimum standards that programs must meet.

### The Wrong Way

The majority on the Committee and the government are both ignoring a growing consensus on the issue of funding commercial child care services. The submissions received by the Select Committee were, with the exception of commercial operators, unanimously in favour of restricting direct funding to not-for-profit services. In a November, 1986 survey commissioned by the Ontario government, three-quarters of the respondents said that non-profit child care centres should be given more favourable treatment by the government than commercial centres. And more than three-quarters of the participants in the hearings across Canada held by the parliamentary Committee on Child Care argued against public support of commercial centres.

The Committee's majority recommendation and the government's plan simply does not make sense. Instead of solving problems, it creates a myriad of inequities and administrative burdens.

The government says that it wants to give direct grants to non-profit centres and to existing commercial centres. It claims that half of the existing spaces are in the commercial sector and that it would not be fair to limit public funding to non-profit centres. For these reasons, it has said that only existing commercial centres would get public funding and that new commercial centres would not be eligible. It has also said that public funding of commercial centres would be phased out eventually.

The goverment and the majority on the Committee are ignoring the fact that an inequitable situation already exists. Commercial centres already have the choice and the opportunity to pay better wages and provide better care. They don't because they choose to make a profit. The government has also over-estimated the number of commercial spaces. Evidence presented to the Select Committee indicates that the government has over-stated the size of the commercial sector by about 20%.

The government's plan would increase, rather than decrease, the differences between the two sectors. It would actually create three tiers of care: non-profit centres that get public funding, commercial centres that get public funding and new commercial centres that don't get public funding. It will only



be a matter of time before new commercial centres insist that they too, should get public funding. What about existing commercial centres who want to expand? And how will the government phase out public funding of the commercial sector? If the government isn't willing to say "no" to the commercial operators now, will it ever?

While the government has indicated that it would consider incentives for the commercial sector to convert to non-profit status, where is the incentive if commercial operators are to be rewarded with subsidized profits? Surely it makes more sense to make the direct grant itself the incentive, payable on condition of conversion to non-profit status.

The government has also indicated that the grant to commercial operators will be tied to salaries and/or fees, that it will be the same amount received by non-profit centres and that commercial operators will have to be accountable in some way for funding received.

But if public funding is tied to salaries it will only perpetuate the wage gap that exists at present between the two sectors, because the amount received by the two sectors will be the same. The government has not indicated what it intends to do with employers in the commercial sector who may refuse to negotiate a wage increase with their workers because they already received one from the government. Nor has it explained what will happen to these workers' wages when public funding is phased out.

We welcome the government's suggestion that commercial operators may have to open their books to public scrutiny to ensure accountability for the funds received. But given this government's reluctance to require posting of inspection reports, let alone financial statements, we say only that we will believe it when we see it.

Although we support the majority decision to post financial statements, we believe that all licensed centres should be required to comply and not just those centres receiving government funds.

We can't help but wonder why the government would take an approach that would require such an enormous increase in bureaucracy to ensure compliance when the non-profit sector offers such a clear alternative in terms of accountability and quality of care.

### The Better Way

New Democrats believe that the government should abandon its foolish plan. More money should be spent on child care, but only for non-profit services.

We have proposed that the government commit at least \$8.00 per day, per child in direct funding. This represents about a third of the cost of care and would go a long way towards improving staff salaries and stabilizing fees to parents.

We also believe that the government should vastly increase its capital funding for child care services. The government spent less than \$3 million in 1985/86 in this area.

Commercial centres also should be offered conditional grants and consultative assistance to encourage them to convert to non-profit status.



**APPENDIX A: List of Witnesses**



As most of the Committee's discussions during the public hearings were centered on government funding of the commercial child care sector, groups and individuals appearing before the Committee have been divided into two main categories; those who support grants to commercial child care operators and those who oppose direct grants to commercial operators. There a few exceptions to this as some groups appeared before the Committee to present their briefs without specifically addressing the issue of direct grants. They have been placed in a separate category.

### LIST OF WITNESSES

#### Groups and Individuals in Opposition to Direct Funding of Commercial Child Care Operators

1. Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, Ms Christa Freiler, Ms Jane Miskin, Mr. Harvey Simmons.  
(SPCMT)
2. Ms. Martha Friendly, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
3. Ontario Coalition for Better Day Care, Ms Laurel Rothman, Ms Jane Beach.  
(OCBDC)
4. Ottawa–Carleton Day Care Association, Ms Rosemary Somers.  
(OCDCA)
5. Day Care Coalition of Metro Toronto. Ms Tess Ayles, Ms Janet Cioffe, Ms Chris Judge, Ms Barbara Lampert, Ms T. Keyes–Bevon  
(DCMT)
6. Family Day Care Services, Mr. John Pepin.  
(FDCS)
7. Ms Joanne Campbell, Metro Councillor, Ward 7
8. Women's Perspective Advisory Committee, Ms Diane Poole, Ms Gloria Pollock, Ms Andrea Doran, Ms Nicollette Caccia, Ms Catherine Swift.  
(WPAC)
9. CUPE, Local 2204
10. Direction 2000, Ms Sharon Richards, Mr. Noel Young

11. Council of Christian Reformed Churches in Canada, Ms Jenny Krabbe, Ms Aileen Van Ginkel.  
(CCRCC)  
(Support for a non-profit child care system was not formally stated in the brief but was supported verbally during presentation to the Committee.)
12. Action Day Care, Ms Evelyn McKee, Ms Janet Davis.  
(ADC)
13. Thames Valley Children's Centre, Mr. Emeka Njoku.  
(TVCC)
14. CUPE, Ontario Division, Mr. Terry O'Connor, Ms Jamie Kass, Ms Karen Stotsky, Ms Irene Harris.
15. Ms Jane Beach, City of Toronto, Planning Land Development.
16. Ontario Coalition for Better Day Care, Ms Susan Colley, Ms Leslie Russel, Ms Julie Griffin, Mr. Pierre Lalonde.  
(OCBDC)
17. National Action Committee on the Status of Women, Ms Barbara Cameron.  
(NAC)
18. Ms Renee Edwards, member of the Task Force on Child Care.  
(Katie Cooke Task Force)
19. Ontario Advisory Council on Women's Issues, Ms Sam Ion, Ms Sandra Kerr.  
(OACWI)

**Groups and Individuals in Support of Funding  
of Commercial Child Care Operators**

1. Happy Child Nursery Schools Ltd., Mr. F. Hunt, Mrs. C. Hunt, Mrs. B. Donoghue.  
(HCNS)
2. Association of Day Care Operators of Ontario, Mr. Jeff Smith, Ms Pat Nowak.  
(ADCO)
3. Playworks Day School Inc., Mr. Joel Zelikovitz
4. Providers and Children Together Association, Ms Mary Ann Wasilka, Ms Caroline Bleckley.  
(P.A.C.T.)

**Other Groups Appearing Before the Committee**

1. Ontario Family Studies Coordinators' Council, Hamilton Board of Education, Ms Beth Jazvac, Ms Beth Brady, Ms S. Head.  
(OFSCC)
2. Direction 2000, Ms Sharon Richards, Mr. Noel Young
3. Peel Lunch and After School Program, Ms Sylvia Leal





APPENDIX B: Child Care Standards By Province, 1986



Child Care Standards By Province, 1986

	Staff Qualifications	Group Size	Staff/Child Ratios
British Columbia	<u>Group Supervisor</u> - 12 months experience in pre-school program -basic minimum training <u>Senior Supervisor</u> -letter of qualification -basic minimum training -registered as "under three supervisor" <u>Under Three Supervisor</u> -completion of infant care studies -registered as supervisor -1 member of staff with first aid training	maximum 25 children/group  maximum 75 children/facility	1:8 children 2:7-9 children 3:18-25 children
Alberta	- one staff in centre with first aid training - no one under 18 years of age can provide care	0-18 months— 6 max 9-35 months—10 max 3- 4 years —16 max 5 years —20 max	0-18 months—1:3 19-35 months—1:5 3-4 years —1:8 5 years —1:10
Saskatchewan	- all staff require some child care training - no one under 16 years of age can provide care	maximum centre size is 60	18-30 months—1:15 30 months-6 yrs 1:10 6-12 years —1:15
Manitoba	<u>Child Care Worker III</u> - diploma, degree or advanced certificate <u>Child Care Worker II</u> - approved certificate or equivalent	maximum centre size is 70	<u>Mixed Age Groups</u> 12 wks-2 yrs—1:4 (8 maximum) 2-6 years —1:8 (16 maximum) 6-12 years —1:15 (20 maximum)

	Staff Qualifications	Group Size	Staff/Child Ratios
Manitoba (continued)	<u>Child Care Worker I (aide)</u> - secondary education - Director of Centre must have CCW III plus 1 year experience - by October 31, 1986 1/3 of Centre staff had CCW II - by October 31, 1988 2/3 must have CCW II or III - all staff must have first aid training		<u>Separate Age Groups</u> 12 wks-1 yr-1:3 (6 maximum) 1-2 yrs-1:4 (8 maximum) 2-3 yrs-1:6 (12 maximum) 3-4 yrs-1:8 (16 maximum) 4-5 yrs-1:9 (18 maximum) 5-6 yrs-1:10 (20 maximum) 6-12 yrs-1:15 (30 maximum)
Ontario	<u>Supervisor</u> - ECE diploma or equivalent - 2 years experience  <u>Providers</u> - at least one person in each group must have an ECE diploma or equivalent	- under 18 months (10 maximum) 18-30 months (15 maximum) 31 months-5 years (24 maximum) 6-9 years (30 max.)	under 18 mons-3:10 18-30 months-1:5 30 months-5 yrs-1:8 5-6 yrs-1:12 6-9 yrs-1:15
Quebec	- 1/3 of providers must have an ECE diploma/certificate/degree in day care, pre-school education or psychology <u>OR</u> 3 years relevant experience - by 1988 all new staff will require a certificate	- maximum centre size is 60	0-17 months-1:5 18 mons-5 yrs-1:8 5-12 years-1:15
New Brunswick	- must have a health certificate - none under 16 may provide care - must be willing to take courses and training	- maximum centre size is 60	2 years- 1:5 3 years-1:7 4 years-1:10 5-12 years-1:15
Newfoundland	- must have first aid course and health certificate - must be willing to take courses and training	- maximum centre size is 50 - children under 2 years of age not permitted in centres	2-3 years-1:6 3-school age-1:8 school age-1:15

	Staff Qualifications	Group Size	Staff/Child Ratios
Nova Scotia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- must have first aid course</li> <li>- April 1987: the administrative officer and 1/3 of staff must have ECE or equivalent</li> <li>- April 1989: 2/3 of staff must have ECE or equivalent</li> </ul>		0-5 years-1:7 5-12 years-1:15
Prince Edward Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- must have health certificate and first aid course</li> <li>- January 1990: all operators and full-time staff must have ECE</li> </ul>	<u>Separate Age Group</u> 2 years —10 max 3-4 years —30 max 5-7 years —36 max  <u>Mixed Age Group</u> under 3 yrs—12 max over 3 yrs—33 max	<u>Under 3 Years</u> 1-4 children: 1 5-8 children: 2  9-12 children: 3

Source: Héline Blais Bates, "Day Care Standards in Canada." In Child Care Standards and Quality (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1986): 49-60.









3 1761 11466741 3

ISBN-0-0729-2593-3